

**REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-11 are pending in the subject application.

By this amendment, independent claims 1 and 8 are amended to incorporate the features of previously presented claims 2 and 9, respectively, claims 2 and 9 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and new dependent claims 12 and 13 are added. Support for the features recited in claims 12 and 13 can be at least found in paragraph [0033] and FIG. 4 of applicants' originally filed specification.

Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-13 are presented to the Examiner for consideration.

**A. Information Disclosure Statement**

On May 8, 2006, applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement and a Form-1449 listing references submitted to the U.S. Patent Office for consideration by the Examiner. Applicants have not yet received a copy of the signed and initialed Form-1449 evidencing consideration of the references listed thereon. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the listed references and return to applicants' undersigned representative a copy of the signed and initialed Form-1449.

**B. Introduction**

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,117,224 to Kawamura et al. ("the Kawamura et al. reference") in view of the Someya et al. reference; rejected claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view the Someya et al. reference and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0038371 to Yoshinaga et al. ("the Yoshinaga et al. reference"); rejected claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Someya

et al. reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,492 to Iwauchi ("the Iwauchi reference"); and rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Someya et al. reference in view of the Iwauchi reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,131,736 to Alvarez ("the Alvarez reference").

C. Applicant Initiated Interview Summary

On June 27, 2006, an applicant initiated interview was conducted. Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to applicants' representative by Examiners Awad and Boddie during the June 27, 2006 personal interview. As required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), applicants' summary of that interview is as follows:

1. Brief Description of any Exhibit Shown

No exhibit was shown or demonstrated during the June 27, 2006 interview.

2. Identification of the Claims Discussed

The Examiners and applicants' representative discussed independent claims 1 and 8.

3. Identification of the Specific Prior Art Discussed

The Examiners and applicants' representative discussed the Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference, and the Yoshinaga et al. reference.

4. Identification of Proposed Amendments

Claims 1 and 8, as amended in the above listing of the claims, was proposed to the Examiner during the June 27, 2006 personal interview.

5. Summary of the Arguments Presented to the Examiner

Applicants' representative presented arguments regarding the failure of Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference, and the Yoshinaga et al. reference. to disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 8. More specifically, applicants' representative

asserted that the Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference, and the Yoshinaga et al. reference fail to provide any suggestion or motivation to combine the references to disclose the combination of features recited in each of independent claims 1 and 8.

6. General Outcome of the Interview

Examiner Boddie agreed to further review the proposed claims and the applied references upon receipt of the filed amendment.

D. Asserted Obviousness Rejections of Claims 1, 2, 8 and 9

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Someya et al. reference; and rejected claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Someya et al. reference and further in view of the Yoshinaga et al. reference. As discussed above, claims 1 and 8 now recite the features of claims 2 and 9. The rejection of claims 1 and 8 is rendered moot by the amendments to the claim 1 and 8, however, the rejection of claims 2 and 9 is traversed as it applies to currently presented claims 1 and 8.

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention would not have been motivated by the teachings of the Kawamura et al. reference and the Someya et al. reference to disclose the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 8 at least because the Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference and claims 1 and 8 each provide different driving schemes. The Kawamura et al. reference displays a blanking period using no-bias control data during non-display periods (col. 4, lines 11-19 and 53-60). On the other hand, Someya et al. reference alternately interposes a white level and a black level at intervals of 1H of the video signal (col. 18, lines 48-65). Applicants submit that one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of the Kawamura et al. reference and the Someya et al. reference to provide an LCD or a method of driving an LCD, wherein during non-display periods between the display periods, the LCD panel is driven to display white light, and during non-display periods at different, distinct time periods from displaying white light during the non-display periods, the LCD panel is driven to display no light.

Further, page 4 of the Office action acknowledges that the Someya et al. reference and the Kawamura et al. reference fail to disclose an LCD or a method for driving an LCD in which "during non-display periods at different, distinct time periods from displaying white light during the non-display periods, driving the LCD panel to display no light" feature now recited in claims 1 and 9. The Examiner relies on the Yoshinaga reference for disclosing this feature.

Applicants submit, however, that the Yoshinaga reference does not disclose this feature and does not overcome the deficiencies of the Someya et al. reference and the Kawamura et al. reference, as applied to currently presented claims 1 and 8. The Yoshinaga et al. reference may disclose a reset operation for writing a black image (paragraph [0063]), however, the reset operation of the Yoshinaga et al. reference does not in any way disclose or suggest employing, e.g., the reset operation for writing a black image in combination with driving an LCD panel to display white light during non-display periods between the display periods.

More particularly, as shown in FIG. 7 of the Yoshinaga et al. reference, the reset period occurs between each color transition, i.e., between the display of red and the display of green, and between the display of green and the display of blue. That is, as discussed in paragraph [0014] of the Yoshinaga et al. reference, the Yoshinaga et al. reference is directed to a RGB field sequential display scheme or field sequential color scheme. As discussed in paragraphs [0012],

[0013] and [0100] of the Yoshinaga et al. reference, the Yoshinaga et al. reference is directed to such a “color filter-less” display employing an RGB field sequential display scheme instead of color filters. Thus, applicants submit that the Yoshinaga et al. reference teaches away from a display device employing color filters and thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not be motivated by the Yoshinaga et al. reference to disclose the combination of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the Someya et al. reference the Kawamura et al. reference and the Yoshinaga et al. reference fail to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claims 1 and 8. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

E. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Someya reference and further in view of the Iwauchi reference. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, the combination of the Kawamura et al. reference and the Someya et al. reference fail to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claims 1 and 8, from which claims 3-5, 7 and 10 directly or indirectly depend. Applicants submit that the Iwauchi reference fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of the Kawamura et al. reference and the Someya et al. reference, as applied to claims 1 and 8. For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the combination of the Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference and the Iwauchi reference fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 3-5, 7, 10 and 11. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

F. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claim 6

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Someya et al. reference in view of the Iwauchi reference and further in view of the Alvarez reference. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, the combination of the Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference and the Iwauchi reference fail to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claim 1, from which claim 6 indirectly depends. Applicants submit that the Alvarez reference fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of the Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference and the Iwauchi reference, as applied to claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the combination of the Kawamura et al. reference, the Someya et al. reference, the Iwauchi reference and the Alvarez reference fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 6. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

G. Request Entry of Amendment

Applicants respectfully request that this amendment be entered at least because the amendment: (1) the amendments to independent claims 1 and 8 does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration, as independent claims 1 and 8 are solely to respectively include features of previously filed, and now cancelled, dependent claims 2 and 9, and thus, the subject matter added to claims 1 and 8 was already considered; (2) new claims 12 and 13 are dependent claims; (3) the amendments were not earlier presented because they are made responsive to the June 27, 2006 personal interview and the May 4, 2006 Office action; and (4) place the claims in better form for an appeal. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

H. Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: July 5, 2006

  
Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

**LEE & MORSE, P.C.**

1101 WILSON BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000

ARLINGTON, VA 22209

703.525.0978 TEL

703.525.4265 FAX

PETITION and  
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.